



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/067,517

02/07/2002

Katsutoshi Inagaki

Q68458

7197

7590

07/19/2006

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2152

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/067,517	INAGAKI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kenny Lin	2152	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,8-13,17 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7 and 14-16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination. Claims 19-20 are canceled.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/18/2006 has been entered.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 5-7 and 14-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
4. The reasons for allowance can be found in the previous office action.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 8-10 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colyer, US 5,862,328, in view of Leong et al (Leong), US 6,393,475.

7. Leong was cited in the previous office action.

8. As per claim 1, 8-10 and 17-18, Sawada taught the invention substantially as claimed including a network system for connecting a terminal device via an agent module comprising:

- a. A terminal device (client); and
- b. An agent module disposed between a network and the terminal device, for relaying an access from the terminal device to the network (server),
- c. Wherein the agent module includes a request signal transmission section for transmitting to the terminal device a request signal requesting to initiate and establish an information transmission enabled state between the terminal device and the agent module, the request signal including identification information to identify the agent module (col.9, lines 64-67, col.10, lines 1-6); and
  - i. The terminal device includes:
    1. a reception section for receiving the transmitted request signal (col.10, lines 2-4);
    2. a first determination section for determining whether the agent module which has transmitted the request signal is an agent

module to which the terminal device receiving the request signal is to be connected (col.10, lines 2-4); and

3. an establishment section for establishing the information transmission enabled state between the terminal device receiving the request signal and the agent module which has transmitted the request signal, when the first determination section ascertains that the agent module which has transmitted the request signal is the agent module to which the terminal device receiving the request signal is to be connected (col.10, lines 2-4: accepting reply from a server inherently include the step of establishing connection with the server and verifying if the reply is addressed for the client or not).

9. Sawada did not specifically teach to connection a plurality of terminal devices. Leong taught that the network can connection a plurality of terminal devices via an agent module (col.6, lines 16-25; fig.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Sawada and Leong because Leong's teaching of connecting with more than one terminal device allows Sawada's network system to establish communications to more than one terminal device.

Art Unit: 2152

10. Claims 2-4 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colyer and Leong as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Sawada, US 6,735,619.

11. Sawada was cited in the previous office action.

12. As per claims 2 and 11, Colyer and Leong taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 10. Colyer and Leong did not specifically teach the limitation of claims 2 and 11.

Sawada taught that the agent module includes:

- a. An identification section for identifying whether another terminal device (col.4, lines 45-48) other than the terminal device is another authorized terminal device that is to be connected to the agent module, when the another terminal devices issues to the network a request for a connection to the terminal device to be connected to the network through the agent module (col.4, lines 45-56, col.5, lines 16-26, col.10, lines 40-49, col.11, lines 6-67, col.12, lines 1-19);
- b. A connection section for connecting the terminal device and the another terminal device after the information transmission enabled state is established between the agent module and the terminal device (col.4, lines 45-56, col.11, lines 6-67, col.12, lines 1-19); and
- c. when the identification section ascertains that the another terminal device is the another authorized terminal device to be connected to the agent module, the request transmission section outputs the request signal to the terminal device to

establish the information transmission enabled state (col.4, lines 45-56, col.11, lines 6-67, col.12, lines 1-19).

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Colyer, Leong and Sawada because Sawada's teaching of identifying and connecting with another terminal device enables Colyer and Leong's system to connect with more than one terminal devices at the same time and supports communication with multiple terminal devices with the agent module.

14. As per claims 3 and 12, Colyer, Leong and Sawada taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 2 and 11. Sawada further taught that the another terminal device is used to remotely control information processing apparatus connected to the terminal device; and when the another terminal device and the terminal device are connected by the connection section, the another terminal device performs a processing for the remote control (col.4, lines 45-56, col.11, lines 6-67, col.12, lines 1-19).

15. As per claims 4 and 13, Colyer, Leong and Sawada taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 3 and 12. Sawada further taught that the information processing apparatus is information recording apparatus for recording information in a recording medium; and the another terminal device performs the remote control to set at least a time from which the information recoding apparatus starts a process for recording the information (col.11, lines 6-67, col.12, lines 1-19; tape record TV program).

***Response to Arguments***

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 8-13 and 17-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sit et al, US 6,349,336.

Zhao, US 2002/0107910.

18. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tue.-Fri. and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.



Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ksl  
July 13, 2006

Handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Keny Zi". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.